## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 11, 2005. Claims 1 to 38 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 24 and 38 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 5, 8 to 10, 17, 21 to 30 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,233,252 (Barker) in view of U.S. Patent 5,151,696 (Miller) and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,128,644 (Nozaki); Claims 6, 7, 11 to 16 and 37 were rejected under § 103(a) over Barker in view of Miller and Nozaki and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,619,649 (Kovnat); Claim 18 was rejected under § 103(a) over Barker in view of Miller and Nozaki and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,862,223 (Walker); and Claims 19, 20 and 31 to 36 were rejected over Barker in view of Miller and Nozaki and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,940,504 (Griswold). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action characterizes Barker's "numbers" or "orders" as sequence codes that identify fragmented files so that the fragmented files can be reassembled according to the numbers or orders. (Office Action page 2). The Office Action asserts that such a code somehow corresponds to the claimed code wherein a receiving device of a recipient can retrieve an accumulated document folder from a destination server via a network based on the code, the code being used to identify the electronic document folder for the recipient. Applicants respectfully submit that even under the Office Action's characterization of Barker's "numbers" or "orders," Barker fails to disclose or suggest the claimed code to one skilled in the art.

Specifically, a code that identifies fragments for reassembly is not seen to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, anything about retrieving an accumulated document folder

- 10 -

from a destination server via a network based on the code. While the Office Action might be correct in interpreting Barker's "numbers" or "orders" as a type of code, the claims do not recite merely "a code." Claim 1, for example, recites a code to identify an electronic document folder intended for a recipient and recites that a receiving device of the recipient can retrieve the accumulated electronic document folder from a destination server via a network based on the code.

The Office Action has not pointed to anything in Barker similar to the claimed code. To the contrary, the Office Action asserts that Barker's "codes" are sequence codes that identify each fragmented file so that the fragmented files can be reassembled according to the numbers or orders. The claims require more. According to the claims, the "code" identifies an electronic document folder, and nothing in the Office Action demonstrates how Barker's sequence number can identify a folder. Moreover, based on the "code," the receiving device of a recipient can retrieve an accumulated electronic document folder from a destination server via a network, and nothing in the Office Action demonstrates Barker's sequence number can be used for such a retrieval. Accordingly, and also in view of the comments that follow, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The invention concerns control over a server in order to distribute document folders to recipient devices of a recipient, wherein the server is a member of a system that includes at least one sending device, a plurality of servers, and at least one receiving device. The recipient is notified of the electronic document folder with an indirect reference, the indirect reference including a code to identify the electronic document folder intended for the recipient. A destination server is selected from amongst the plurality of servers based on data provided by the recipient, the data including address information of

- 11 -

the destination server designated by the recipient. A temporarily-stored electronic document folder is thereafter accumulated at the selected destination server, wherein the receiving device of the recipient can retrieve the accumulated electronic document folder from the destination server via a network based on the code included in the indirect reference, such that the code is used to identify the electronic document folder intended for the recipient.

Barker describes that computer 11 sends fragmented files to motion picture theater 17, and that the motion picture theater 17 combines the fragmented files. After combining them, the motion picture theater 17 displays the combined files with a projector. Thus, Barker discloses nothing more than a direct transmission of fragmented files, perhaps including a sequence number for accurate reassembly. This is different from the invention, whose transmission is "indirect," based on an indirect reference that contains a code for identifying an electronic document folder, based on which a receiving device can retrieve the accumulated electronic document folder from a destination server via a network.

The Office Action relies on Barker's column 3, lines 26 to 62 to suggest a correspondence between Barker and the claimed notifying a recipient of the electronic document folder with an indirect reference including a code to identify the electronic folder. (Office Action page 4). The Office Action characterizes the claim language as "[r]eceiving ... the indirect reference including a code." (Office Action page 4). On the contrary, the claims recite "notifying ... with an indirect reference, the indirect reference including a code."

The Office Action also asserts that a recipient in Barker receives document fragments, each fragment having an indirect reference including a code. Thus, the Office

- 12 -

Action mistakenly corresponds Barker's direct receipt of a coded fragment file with the claimed notifying a recipient with an indirect reference, including a code.

In addition, the Office Action relies on Barker's column 3, lines 4 to 19 and 52 to 62 and Fig. 2 to suggest a correspondence with the claimed accumulating the temporarily stored electronic document folders at the destination server wherein the recipient can retrieve the accumulated document folder from the destination server via a network based on the code. Yet, the cited portions of Barker are not seen to disclose or suggest, *inter alia*, anything like the claimed destination server. On the contrary, the Office Action asserts that Barker teaches "a recipient receives document fragments." (Office Action page 4). Thus, nothing in Barker teaches anything like the claimed destination server because, according to the Office Action's assertion, Barker's recipient directly receives the file fragment along with the code.

The Office Action conceded that Barker does not disclose or suggest anything concerning notification with an indirect reference including a code. Reliance was placed on lines 30 to 55 at column 6 of Miller, as allegedly disclosing such subject matter, but Applicants respectfully submit such a reliance is misplaced.

Lines 30 to 55 of Miller's column 6 describes that a server sends a client an ANNOUNCE PACKET for setting a multicast group, and only when a REGISTRATION PACKET is sent from the client in response to the sending of the ANNOUNCE PACKET, the server sends a file to the client. As a consequence of this simple two-way communication between a client and a server, when Miller's server sends a file to the client, it does so directly, and only after inquiring of the client whether the transmission is acceptable to the client. Thus, Miller does not disclose or suggest that an electronic

- 13 -

document folder is sent to a destination server for the client's indirect access, as in the subject invention.

With respect to Miller's ANNOUNCE PACKET, it is true that such a packet is utilized for setting a multicast group. However, in the present invention, an indirect reference contains a code that is sent to a recipient for identifying an electronic document folder on a destination server, based on which the recipient can retrieve the electronic document folder from the destination server via a network. Thus, nothing in Miller's ANNOUNCE PACKET would disclose or suggest anything to those of ordinary skill concerning the indirect reference of the subject invention.

Nozaki has been reviewed but is not seen to add anything pertinent to the above deficiencies of Barker and Miller. Withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

- 14 -

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,

California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to

our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicants
Michael K. O'Neill
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 93059v3

- 15 -